01		
02		
03		
04		
05		
06	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON	
07	AT SEATTLE	
08	MICHAEL B. FJERSTAD,) CASE NO. C08-0791-RSM
09	Plaintiff,))
10	v.	ORDER RE: MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION
11	UNITED STATES DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION, et al.,) RECONSIDERATION)
12	Defendants.))
13	Defendants.))
14	Plaintiff Michael B. Fjerstad submitted a motion for reconsideration of the Order denying	
15	his motion for appointment of counsel. (Dkt. 13.) Having considered plaintiff's request, the	
16	Court finds and ORDERS as follows:	
17	(1) Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1), "[t]he Court may request an attorney to	
18	represent any person unable to afford counsel." However, there is no right to appointment of	
19	counsel in a civil case. See United States v. 30.64 Acres of Land, 795 F.2d 796, 801 (9th Cir.	
20	1986). Moreover, the Court may appoint counsel only in exceptional circumstances. <i>Wilborn</i>	
21	v. Escalderon, 789 F.2d 1328, 1331 (9th Cir. 1986). A finding of exceptional circumstances	
22	requires an evaluation of both the likelihood of success on the merits and the ability of the	
	ORDER RE: MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION PAGE -1	

individual to articulate his claims pro se in light of the complexity of the legal issues involved. Id. 02 In this case, concluding that it could not be said that plaintiff has demonstrated a likelihood of 03 success on the merits, or shown that, in light of the complexity of the legal issues involved, he is 04 unable to articulate his claims pro se, the Court denied plaintiff's motion for appointment of 05 counsel. (Dkt. 12.) 06 Local Rule 7(h) provides: 07 Motions for reconsideration are disfavored. The court will ordinarily deny such motions in the absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to its 08 attention earlier with reasonable diligence. 09 CR 7(h)(1). Here, having considered plaintiff's motion for reconsideration of the Order denying his motion for appointment of counsel, the Court finds no showing of either manifest error or new 12 facts or legal authority. Accordingly, plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Dkt. 13) is DENIED. 13 (2) The Clerk shall send a copy of this Order to the parties and to the Honorable Ricardo S. Martinez. 15 DATED this 18th day of September, 2008. 16 17 Mary Alice Theiler United States Magistrate Judge 18 19 20 21 22

ORDER RE: MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION PAGE -2